

# **Arizona Invasive Species Advisory Council**

**May 2, 2006 10:00a.m. - 4:00p.m.**

**Arizona Department of Agriculture – Room 206**

**1688 West Adams Street, Phoenix**

## **MEETING NOTES**

Larry Riley called the meeting to order at 10:04am. Mr. Riley welcomed Mr. Don Butler (ADA Co-Chair) who thanked the group and he expressed his appreciation of the effort and time that is going into this report and it looks like it is all starting to come together. He has been in touch with Lori Faeth and wishes us well on our final journey.

### **Review and Vote on Minutes/Notes**

Patti Fenner noted that the word “crutch” (on page 2, second paragraph) should be “crux”. Bill Werner commented that he had submitted his changes via email to Tom McMahon, who stated these changes had been added. There were no further discussions on any changes.

Mr. Werner motioned and Ed Northam seconded the acceptance of the meeting notes from April 20<sup>th</sup>, 2006. **Motioned approved by Council.**

### **PowerPoint Presentation**

Dr. John Brock gave a PowerPoint presentation on Arizona Weed Management Strategy. Some questions were brought up after the presentation. Mr. Werner asked how this document interrelates to what we are doing now. Dr. Brock said that the council is welcome to pull items from this to use in the final report. Dr. Jeff Lovich asked why animals weren't included. Dr. Brock responded that animals were not the breadth of the problem and they were just copying other states and their model on invasive species. Heidi Vasiloff asked about our report and did the Council catch all the same steps that Dr. Brock had presented. He replied that he believed the Council had. Mr. Riley asked about weed strategy and was the focus on non-native weeds or was it broader? Dr. Brock replied that they too had wrestling matches over this and they geared it more towards to alien invasive species. Ed Northam commented that the definition was based on the plants that transformed the structures and functions of ecosystems. Mr. Riley asked about rapid response and do you envision any problems and issues that have to be overcome to truly respond rapidly in these types of situations? Dr. Brock replied yes and they need an EA or EIS to do that or must have categorical exclusions to facilitate a rapid response. The problem is that sometimes these can take a few years to get. Mr. Riley asked about chemical tools and addressing herbicides and pesticides and the controversy that goes along with these. Ed Northam talked about another problem with early detection and that new species that haven't been seen before are not on anybody's list and therefore there is no authority there to enforce anything. Mr. Werner asked the question on how long it takes to get anything on the list and the response from Jeff Myers was that it could take several months. Riley noted that there is an emergency rule making process that could eliminate the need to go thru the longer process.

Mr. Riley asked about the restoration component. Dr. Brock talked about salt cedar stands and how there is very little non-native vegetation left, thus the need to continue restoration approaches. Dr. Lovich noted that the southwest willow flycatchers are selecting the salt cedars for nesting. Mr. Werner stated that approximately 65% of these birds are using the salt cedar for nesting, but the real question is “Is salt cedar a symptom or a cause?” Glenn Fahringer said he had an article to share with the council on invasive weeds and how they change the micrological (sic) structure of the soil. Dr. Lovich discussed the fatal attraction because of the propensity of salt cedars stands to burn and it may condemn the nesting success

of these birds. Mike Macauley said to look at New Mexico and their success on the treatment of salt cedar. Dr. Brock discussed the success of this and how they have been using arsenal herbicides to treat them and how they could pinpoint stands using a GPS system where they could shut off the sprayers over any protected areas. Mr. Riley's stated his reason for bringing up the issue was in one instant, we can try to treat and remove, but if our expectations are to let nature take its course, that doesn't necessarily follow and we will need to restore. Dr. Brock talked about the Grand Canyon and how they were whacking weeds along the tributaries and doing invasive treatments. They are seeing success with this and Dr. Brock likes this idea. Mr. Riley and Dr. Brock agreed that in order to do treatment, you must have a restoration strategy. A good example is the Navajo Reservation and the use of Russian olive trees introduced to control erosion. They have now become very invasive on the creeks. Heidi Vasiloff talked about the Tres Rios and Rio Salado projects and how this would be a perfect opportunity to hit hard on the issue. She asked if we were hitting hard on connecting to the County on this. Dr. Brock said the Maricopa County Flood Control District is currently watching for salt cedar and African sumac in these areas. Mr. Riley asked about thoughts on international port of entries and Mexico and what is going on there. Dr. Brock said that we are depending heavily on APHIS and US Customs agents to do their job. The recognition is getting there. New Zealand mussels are a good example on what to look out for. Mr. Northam noted that it can be tough to do and a good example is potatoes. Mr. Riley said it needs to be based on risk assessment. Dr. Brock said that once the Council passes away, what would happen in its aftermath and what will be drawn up? Patti Fenner talked about the center. Dr. Brock said to push for that Invasive Species Center and work thru existing mechanisms like Natural Resource Conservation Districts. The center will be great for a funding resource and dispersing those funds. Ms. Fenner asked where the center fits in. Dr. Brock sees it as its own thing which could operate under MOU's, or as a separate entity like SRP. Mr. Riley sees the center with two elements: one being the policy element and the other being a source of information and expertise. The real power would be the ability to provide information expertise and outreach opportunities to inform policy making. He advocates that some "Son of the Council" continues into the future to coordinate better at many different levels. It is a delicate task to coordinate federal land management, with state land management, with state and federal wildlife management, with tribal land management, but he feels this Council could provide guidance. Mr. Macauley recommended that there should be a supervisor from each agency that could be part of that council. There was more discussion on the function of the center and receiving and distribution of funds. Rick Brusca mentioned that the important focus should be to provide oversight management to the Internet base and computer database mapping and have an independent council. Thank you to Dr. Brock on a great presentation and discussion.

### **Update/Discussion**

Mr. Riley discussed that the ISAC Definitions Subcommittee finalized Draft 9 of the National invasive species definition. He noted that we have been consistent with our definition.

### **1<sup>st</sup> Working DRAFT of the Governors Report**

Heidi Vasiloff handed out a copy of a draft report for everyone to look over. She spent a lot of quality time going over the team's reports and pulling out similar items. She was looking at what the Governor asked us to do and how well we were answering the questions asked of her. She noted that the five recommendations (so far) are:

1. Develop a future Council
2. Create a Center for Invasive Species
3. Develop a database/mapping system
4. Adopt the definition
5. Adopt a priority species list

Randy Yavitz asked a question on the Center and the mapping/database. Why are they separate? Ms. Vasiloff said the only reason why they were separate because the report dealt with those in different ways. Mr. Riley suggested that they should be kept separate. Ms. Vasiloff encourages the Council to extract other pieces out of this draft to make their own recommendations. Mr. Werner suggested the Center could be the home for the database. She asked if these 5 recommendations feel like they could stand alone. Dr. Lovich told Ms. Vasiloff she has done a great job on this draft, but would like some time for the Council to read the draft over before they go on any further. Mr. Riley asked that everyone to take time right now (20 minutes) to review the draft to see if we are responding to the Governors Executive Order and please give feedback. Mr. Yavitz asked who the reader of the final report is and will it be too overwhelming? Mr. Riley noted that we need to watch the volume of words and need to keep it brief.

Dr. Lovich brought up human health and disease issues and that we need more information on animals because this will be the hook for the public. He used the examples of West Nile Virus and the Avian Bird Flu as a good way of getting people's attention on why to care. He suggests an introduction on why invasive species are bad and why this strategy is good and the costs associated with it. Dan Shein said to take a look at the bullets on the front page and suggests prioritizing these. Ms. Vasiloff said that one of the challenges is the need to extract some more points for those recommendations. Jodi Latimer noted it was important to acknowledge that everybody felt that the need for establishing the Center was crucial. Ms. Latimer noted a couple of conflicting statements which were discussed. Mr. Yavitz mentioned that there is a lot of duplication in the report and suggested two approaches to solve that. Mr. Riley noted that maybe the council should demonstrate some fairly close correspondence to follow pattern of the National Plan and take advantage of previous efforts. Dr. Lovich suggested that being devious can be good and we should plagiarize from other State and National plans. Organization is the best way to meet objectives. Mr. Fahringer said to keep in mind and to remember that people reading this won't know (or care) why we broke into groups. The end product has to flow.

Ms. Vasiloff asked if we have everything that meets all the points within the Governors Executive Order. Mr. Werner asked Ms. Vasiloff what the Council may have missed. Ms. Vasiloff noted that nothing really jumped out, just a few vague items. Tom McMahon then suggested we closely examine item 6 (six) from the Governors Executive Order and go over each point-by-point to make sure it was covered.

**6A.** Mr. Macauley asked about coordination and interacting with all entities. Mr. Riley noted Mr. Macauley had a good point and the first step is coordination and a need for structure so we are not violating private property rights and interests, but working together. This will be a big challenge. Ms. Vasiloff said the Research and Info Management working group did a good job on reporting the research efforts but maybe we haven't done a good job on coordinating some other subjects. Should we add another recommendation? Ms. Latimer suggests we borrow the language under Recommendation 1 to include local, state, and private entities underneath the recommendation concerning the "Son" of this Council. Mr. Riley said we need to recommend that there are structures that work well, but maybe some that also need some work. Ultimately, we must show the need for ideas and how to approach it. The question was asked on clarifying some of the recommendations and should we do it as it group or send it out for review. It was unanimous consent that we do it as a Council. Mr. Brusca asked for clarification on page six and who is that being addressed to. Dr. Lovich stated that would be the Governor and she will say what she likes and what she does not. Mr. Macauley said that if he were the reader, he would like to see choices and recommendations. Have a plan A and B and state what will work best. Mr. Fahringer said to be short, precise, and concise on report to Governor and we should directly respond to her questions. Dr. Lovich suggests we use really broad recommendations and say what really needs to be done and allow the system to decide. Mr. Riley agreed with Mr. Fahringer and the idea that the "Son" of Council could be tasked to flush out plan A, B, and C. Mr. Yavitz asked if anybody has talked to Lori Faeth about how specific the Governor wants the Council to be? Mr. Riley offered to spend some time

with Ms. Faeth to find out more on specifics. Ms. Latimer said that every working group evaluated the current situation in Arizona and recommended the continuation of an Advisory Council. This is a “consensus vision.” Ms. Vasiloff asked the council about the visions of the Center such as coordination and location. It was discussed that maybe the council should discuss locations and mention that in the report. Mr. Yavitz mentioned there should be four main functions of the center. It is a repository of technical information, source of public information, database/mapping function, and mechanism for obtaining and dispersing funds. Mr. Riley agrees with the first three but questioned the fourth. Ms. Latimer stated she was reluctant to put mapping/database under the center. Mr. Yavitz suggested having access to this system at the Center. Mr. Riley said the Center is a valuable thing to develop but not sure how all the pieces will fit together. Can it be a cooperative venture? Mr. Fahringer thought that the Center was more of a clearinghouse where information could be brought in or taken out. Ms. Vasiloff asked who the keeper of the Center is. Will it be a Councils job to oversee it? Please give feedback to Heidi.

**6B.** Definition already motioned. Ms. Latimer noted that the word “alien” needs to be deleted. Ms. Vasiloff asked whether or not to include the species list under this. Ms. Latimer suggests that the council should develop a process for modification of the lists.

**6C.** Ms. Vasiloff noted that there wasn’t much in the way of duplications and inconsistencies among or within agencies. Mr. Riley said there was one area which had to do with certification of applicators. He noted that we did identify that issue.

**6D.** Ms. Vasiloff mentioned that there was lots of discussion in the reports. Mr. Riley identified one gap is building capacity and further development of programs.

**6E.** Mr. Yavitz asked about the size of the report. Will it be too thick or too thin? Mr. Brusca suggested doing the report in two volumes; summary and report. Mr. Macauley said we should note that Arizona wants to be the leader in invasive species and put that in the beginning of the report. It was discussed that the goals and objectives are covered in a variety of locations in the report. Ms. Latimer suggested we expand on the relationship and definition of invasive species categories. Do the whys and whats. Dr. Lovich asked what we are proposing in order to be the leader. He suggested we need to emphasize why we are going to be the leader. Mr. Riley thinks the leadership comes in a few different ways. One is leadership within our own state and the other would be our demonstrating that leadership regionally or nationally. What are we proposing to position ourselves to be the leader? Ms. Vasiloff mentioned that the funding and resource need to conduct management activities is very weak and there was discussion on the scalability of funding. The role of cooperative weed management areas and volunteer groups was discussed. Ms. Vasiloff asked the question concerning if the Council was in agreement on the roles of WMA’s. Mr. Macauley believes that whatever we come up with, it will be a combination of WMA’s working in conjunction with Conservation Districts. There was also discussion on WMA’s focus on weeds, but what is being done about the wildlife side? The role of volunteer groups was also discussed. Mr. Shein suggested incentives for those groups that go beyond the baseline minimum. Mr. Riley asked what would be the best way of expressing that to the volunteer groups without telling them what they can and cannot do. Ms. Vasiloff said we need to articulate the vision and what would be the role of volunteer groups. There was discussion on private land and Arizona Title 48 concerning the narrowing of limitations. Ms. Latimer said that the Sonoran Desert Invasive Species Council is a great example on WMA’s, NRCDC’s, and signed MOU’s, and how invasive species could be managed. It was discussed that volunteer groups may or may not get on this band wagon. What will be option two for those who don’t step up to the plate? Dr. Lovich said to word this only as a model for now. Mr. Riley mentioned that we should be looking at volunteer contributions and matching resources and pursue federal grant money that

is available. A question was asked of Mr. Riley to Mr. Myers on what are the other alternatives?

**ACTION ITEM: Option B Plan(???)**

Ms. Vasiloff believes we covered most on the inventory, monitoring, mapping, and data management. Ms. Latimer also mentioned that there are grant funds or federal dollars available. Public awareness, education, and outreach were discussed with the note that we need funding and organization to make these happen. Ms. Vasiloff said to add that this can't go forward unless we have an organized outreach effort. Ms. Latimer supports this as adding another recommendation to item six and Mr. Myers seconded that motion (???). Ms. Vasiloff said we need to hit home as the public information campaign is a critical point. Ed Northam said that the WMA's get on the ground with people and they can help to get the public more involved. This may be a good connection back to the volunteer program, Ms. Vasiloff noted. Mr. Brusca asked who the key audiences are and what the school standards are. Maybe we can tie this into off highway or project wild programs. Compliance and Enforcement was also another weak area. Inspection stations were discussed again. Dr. Lovich asked if this was a good place to add existing listing statutes. Under 2C in Leadership and Coordination, strike require and change it to encourage. Mr. Werner had a suggestion on a funding source for cleaning boats at the lakes. There was more discussion on enforcement and training being a problem. Mr. Riley asked about cross training field officers so they are aware of key issues. Mr. Myers asked about the role of the County and used West Nile Virus as an example. Vector control is currently a County issue, not the State.

**Parking Lot**

Discussion of County and Municipality enforcement and their levels of interaction.

Integrated invasive species management principals were discussed. Mr. Riley suggested we addressed the strategic approaches already. Dr. Brock said that the outline on page nine covered most of this. He thought we could add something about treatments that will reduce the organism population and adding a realistic timeline for monitoring. It could take 3-5 years to reduce the populations. Ms. Latimer asked about the best management principals for Arizona. Mr. Riley asked about an iconic approach for Arizona. Some cities already have native plant ordinances.

Actions for implementation, evaluation, and adaptive management were discussed next. Mr. Riley feels we did touch on this with the function of the Center and the ability to provide feedback. Mr. Riley said the effectiveness of outreach could be measured and evaluated. Mr. Werner suggests doing a review of the list roughly every five years. Mr. Riley said the goal should be no more invasive species in Arizona. There may be things we aren't thinking about today, but may challenge us in the future. Mr. Yavitz suggested evaluating public awareness by volunteers and polls.

- White paper definition-citing
- Volunteer organizations and why we need them
- Incentives – To L&C?
- County and Municipals

Please email Tom McMahon or Ms. Vasiloff with any comments on what was discussed today.

**Old Business**

None presented

**New Business**

None presented

**Identification of future meetings dates/times/locations**

May 23, 2006 – 10am to 4pm - Dept. of Agriculture, Room 206

June 5, 2006 – 10am to 4pm - Dept. of Agriculture, Room 206

June 22, 2006 - TBD

**Call to the Public**

None were presented

**Adjourned at 2:35pm**